UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,071	03/26/2004	Simon Fenney	3700.P0373US	8073
	7590 05/19/200 L BOUTELL & TANIS	EXAMINER		
2026 RAMBLII	NG ROAD	HAJNIK, DANIEL F		
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2628		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/811,071	FENNEY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
DANIEL F. HAJNIK	2628	

	DANIEL F. HAJNIK	2628	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP 1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on	the same day as filing a Notice of	Appeal. To avoid abar	
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	with 37 CFR 41.31; or	(3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☑ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 30 April 2008. A brief in	n compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 m	ust be filed within two	months of the
date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further col	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	•	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	npliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5-12 and 14-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Ulka Chauhan/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant reworded portions of the method steps in claim 1 and reworded portions of the apparatus in claim 10. These amendments do not overcome the 35 USC 103 rejection of record, and require further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues Redshaw does not teach the claimed features in the method of claim 1 (middle of page 9 to the bottom of page 10 in filed response).

The examiner respectfully maintains that the rejections are proper because in Redshaw the objects and tiles are directly related to the claimed invention. In addition, Redshaw uses bounding boxes around objects themselves as claimed. Redshaw states, "A set of tiles can then be selected which define a bounding box for a particular object and, in order to render that particular object, only the tiles within that particular bounding box needs to be processed" (page 2, lines 17-21, emphasis added, also see figure 5). In respect to this passage, the system of Redshaw is placing emphasis on the processing of objects in the rendered scene but uses the tiles as a way for performing processing on these objects. However, even through tiles are used the system still uses bounding boxes and objects.

Redshaw considers culling an object if a bounding box misses all the sampling points by determining whether the triangles of the object are visible or not. Redshaw states (page 3, lines 26-27, "We have appreciated that any object can be modeled as a set of triangles") and states (page 5, lines 16-18, "after which further tests can be made on it to determine whether or not it is to be used to make a contribution to the image being processed"). Redshaw also checks for sampling points (pg. 13, lines 9-11, "In order to test whether a tile lies wholly on the outside of an edge, we need only test the point on that corner of the tile which is closest to the edge" where this point can be a sampling point). The claimed object list is shown in figure 5. In this case, an object will still be culled if all of the triangles of that object are determined to be not visible (such as in the case of small objects where there may be only one or two possible triangles for a given projection view).